

PIN 5136

APPLICANT Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

PROJECT TITLE Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Bay, and South Monterey Bay IRWMP and ICWMP

COUNTY Monterey

AMOUNT REQUESTED \$496,957

TOTAL PROJECT COST \$1,228,650

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop a functionally equivalent IRWMP that will function as an Integrated Coastal Watershed Management Plan for the Region consisting of the groundwater basins and major watersheds in the Monterey Peninsula, Carmel Bay, and South Monterey Bay areas. The plan will be adopted by December 31, 2006.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score:** 9/15

**Comment:** The proposal does not describe the tasks in enough detail and therefore the outcome of each task is difficult to determine. More points would have been awarded if more detail was given on the tasks to be performed. The description of deliverables and how they will be used is not adequate. For some of the tasks the specific methods, schedule, and frequency of activities that will be implemented is not clearly stated. There are no measurable goals outlined; however, Task 7.2 defines a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as the entity that will develop measurable goals in the future.

#### *MPWMD Comments:*

- Concerning measurable goals, in Section 3.0, “Key issues”, several goals are listed including meeting State mandated orders concerning dam safety, water use, and storm water discharges (see key issues section)
  - Water extraction from Carmel Valley must be reduced by 75% in the long term
  - Dry season storm water discharges to ASBS must be reduced to zero and all winter discharges treated
  - San Clemente Dam must be made seismically stable and must meet current flood safety standards
- Restoration of the steelhead run in the Carmel River is a key goal (see Key Issues). This involves a measurable goal – the number of annual adult migrants.
- Implicit in the Key Issues section is reduction of urban storm water discharges to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and an increase in near-shore water quality.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5/5

**Comment:** The basis for the regional boundary is presented and is well defined. The applicant provides a good description of internal boundaries and water related infrastructure. A map of the region is included. The applicant discusses the water resource quality and quantity as well as ASBSs adjacent to the region. The applicant also addresses ecological processes, resources, and social and economic trends in the region.

*No MPWMD Comments.*

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8/10

**Comment:** The ICWMP objectives are described in detail. Objectives are inclusive of surface water and ground water management, water supply augmentation, water conservation, ecosystem restoration, water quality improvements, conflict resolution, and statewide priorities. However, the process of how these objectives were determined is not clearly stated. It is also not clear how the end results will meet the proposed objectives.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- Plan objectives were drafted by the regional group in roundtable discussions held initially with the Monterey Regional Stormwater Group and then with the regional stakeholders (see “Executive Summary”). A draft of the Plan objectives was circulated to stakeholders for comment and revised before submitting the Planning Grant application.
- Virtually all of the objectives directly or indirectly address the key issues listed in Section 3.0, which were developed with stakeholder input.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 6/10

**Comment:** The applicant indicates that the IRWMP/ICWMP will incorporate the methodology of the CCA watershed assessment action plan. Assurances and details of how that will take place are not evident. The proposal also discusses many strategies but

doesn't say how they work together to produce some synergistic effect in water management.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- As discussed in Section 5.1.2, integration of several water management strategies related to surface water supply, groundwater management, conservation, reclamation and comprehensive resource protection and restoration has been ongoing since the early 1980's under the direction of MPWMD. While not explicitly stated, the effect of this comprehensive approach has been to reverse degradation of Public Trust resources in Carmel Valley while preventing seawater intrusion in the Seaside Basin (see discussion of Key Issues).
- Many of the strategies presented that have one or two main purposes result in additional benefits (e.g., reducing dry weather discharges into ASBS may result in fewer beach closures and more public recreation). Strategies to increase the water supply also have many synergistic effects (more reliable water supply, resolve conflicts, improve habitat, increase economic activity).
- Additional information on synergistic effects of the water management strategies discussed is contained in the July 14, 2005 Implementation Grant proposal and project description.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 6/10

**Comment:** There is no general schedule for implementation beyond adoption. The emerging institutional structure seems to be the use of a TAC; however, how the TAC would be formed or who would be eligible to serve is unclear. Mechanisms for monitoring performance of the plan and modifying the plan are contained in Task 7.2.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- The initial institutional structure consisted of all the stakeholders moving forward as a group through the Planning Grant application process. As a result, formation of a TAC was identified as the best method for continuation of focused efforts. A TAC was appointed by a consensus of the stakeholder group and consists of representatives of agencies with authority over and/or an interest in the strategies presented in the Plan.
- Specific projects (and a schedule for completing them) that are consistent with the goals, objectives, and strategies presented in the Plan are proposed in the July 14, 2005 Implementation Grant proposal.

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8/10

**Comment:** The proposed plan can provide significant benefits but the relationship of benefits to the ASBSs is not clearly stated. The application contains a plan to analyze potential impacts. Item 8.2 lists anticipated benefits of implementing the plan. Item 8.3 is compliance with CEQA. The applicant states that development of the plan is exempt from CEQA. The project could have scored higher if the project benefits more clearly supported the objectives.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- While it may not have been explicitly stated, benefits include meeting State-mandated orders, which are the subject of several objectives within the proposal Plan. All projects described or listed help meet the objectives in the plan.

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 3/5

**Comment:** Section 9 of the work plan presents a chronology of activities, studies, or documents that support each water management strategy presented in the plan. Sections 9.4 to 9.11 state only that a bibliography is to be developed. More points would have been awarded if the supporting activities and documents were more clearly tied to what is proposed in the plan and where data gaps need to be filled in order to move the plan forward.

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 4/5

**Comment:** The proposal presents Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) as the main data management agency. MPWMD has outreach and data management capability. The coordination with State databases is limited to posting the plan on CERES. There is coordination with other databases such as Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Water Quality Evaluation and the Sanctuary Integrated Monitoring Network. The proposal would have scored higher if there was some clarity about the centralized electronic water resource library and how that function is necessary to the planning effort (i.e. what data is being generated and what data needs to be managed).of efforts is good.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- A centralized water resource library is needed due to the vast number of plans, reports, EIRs and other documents that have been and are continuing to be developed in the Region that are related to the Key Issues and Plan objectives and goals. MPWMD has been the *de facto* repository for many of these documents; however, as more State, local, and Federal agencies and conservation groups become involved in water resource management in the Region, MPWMD is finding that information is being spread out over several agencies and that not all parties working on an issue are aware of what information is available.
- Some of the components of the IRWM Plan have not been completed and may benefit in their development from a central file server with relevant resource documents.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 3/5

**Comment:** A list of cooperative entities that will serve as stakeholders is provided in the project summary. The proposal doesn't include a schedule or procedure that describes the roles and responsibilities of the listed entities. In addition there is no mechanism to identify additional stakeholders.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- As discussed in the Executive Summary, prior to completing the Planning Grant proposal, MPWMD contacted virtually every government, non-profit, and interest group in the Region and asked for participation in preparing a proposal.
- In Section 2.3 in the Region description, there is a brief description of the stakeholders involved.
- MPWMD believes that a thorough outreach was conducted prior to submitting a Planning Grant proposal; however, it is anticipated that as the IRWM Plan is developed and presented for review and adoption throughout the Region, that additional stakeholders not identified initially will come forward.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 2/5

**Comment:** The applicant indicates there are no disadvantaged communities in the region. The applicant does mention that disadvantaged community concerns would be a subject for discussion in initial meetings regarding plan development. The applicant may

need to consider Castroville and Salinas for possible environmental justice concerns in that region.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- For this Proposal, MPWMD presumed that since Castroville and Salinas are outside the Region boundary that the Region has no disadvantaged communities or environmental justice concerns. However, MPWMD will investigate whether projects involving the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency would qualify under this category.
- MPWMD may investigate whether projects within the Region that address State-mandated orders can be considered for additional scoring under meeting environmental justice concerns.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 2/5

**Comment:** Many planning activities are listed but there is little linkage to how the proposed plan will support or integrate with local plans (i.e. County General Plan, Local Coastal Plan).

*MPWMD Comments:*

- All agencies with Local Plans are represented in the stakeholder group and will be involved in the development and adoption of the Plan.

**AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 2/5

**Comment:** The proposed ICWMP will not support land use decision making other than where water shortages are a primary limitation. Integration of Management Measures into land use planning is absent. A mechanism on how the proposed project will be coordinated with other agencies is not well described.

*MPWMD Comments:*

- All agencies with Local Plans are represented in the stakeholder group and will be involved in the development, adoption, and implementation of the Plan (see stakeholder letters).
- The proposal involves strategies other than dealing with water supply shortages, such as restoring the steelhead run (with methods other than increasing water

supply) and increasing recreational opportunities. More details are presented in the Implementation Grant proposal.

**TOTAL SCORE: 58**